

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P. O. Box 1450
Atexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/940,422	08/29/2001	Lorraine Mary Edmeades	1430-272	5500
23117 7	2590 02/26/2004		EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC		SODERQUIST, ARLEN		
8TH FLOOR	LKOAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714			1743	-

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/940,422	EDMEADES ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Arlen Soderquist	1743				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2003.						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 12-15 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 12-15 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	*	• •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		•				
	aminer. Note the attached office	Action of 10/11/1 10-132.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No. <u>09/265,670</u> . ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12-18-03. 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1743

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The claims are directed to a specific compound and its use for a specific purpose.

Page 2

- 2. Claim 13 provides for the use of a compound as a reference marker in testing the stability of a sample of lamotrigine, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.
- 3. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).
- 4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claim 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b,e) as being anticipated by Floyd (WO 97/00681 and US 5,492,510). In the published application and US Patent Floyd teaches a pharmaceutical composition containing lamotrigine. Tables 2 and 3 give results from assays of

Application/Control Number: 09/940,422

Art Unit: 1743

the compositions for stability. In Table 2, the first column under the related substances is for the compound 3-amino-5-keto-6-(2,3-dichlorophenyl)-1,2,4-triazine (footnote g), which is the instantly claimed 3-amino-6-(2,3-dichlorophenyl)-1,2,4-triazine-5(4H)-one. Footnote a of Table 3 teaches that the assay was a High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) procedure according to the Analytical Standard. In Table 3, the second column shows the concentration of the instantly claimed compound (see footnote b). On pages 8-10 of the publication and columns 5-6 of the patent a process of producing a pharmaceutical dosage and its stability testing it is outlined. The process includes mixing the components together and drying them into a solid form (steps 1-9), stressing the dried product (step 10), reconstituting the dried product and assaying the product as outlined in tables 3-4 (steps 11-12).

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Floyd as applied to claims 12-13 above, and further in view of Papadoyannis. Floyd does not teach the use of standard solutions.

In the paper Papadoyannis presents an efficient off-line solid-phase extraction (SPE) of lamotrigine (LTG) from human serum and urine prior to HPLC analysis. High extraction recoveries were achieved from C8 bond Elut cartridges (200mg/3ml), using acidic acetonitrile for the elution of LTG and the internal standard, 3,5-diamino-6-(2-methoxyphenyl)-1,2,4-triazine. Isocratic reversed-phase HPLC (RP-HPLC) analysis on octyl silica, using a Lichrosorb

Application/Control Number: 09/940,422

Art Unit: 1743

RP-8, 5 μ m, 250 × 4.6 mm column and a mobile phase consisting of pH 5.6 0.05M acetate buffer-MeCN (72:28) was sensitive and rapid. The identification of LTG was performed by UV detection at 306nm. The method detected approx. 0.9 ng LTG on-column, using a 20- μ L loop, and linearity holds from ~ 0.044 to 7.8 μ g/mL in standard solutions. These standard solutions were used to form a calibration chart for determining concentrations and also for checking the day-to-day precision and accuracy. In plasma and urine, the limits of detection are 1.1 and 1.2 ng, respectively, while linearity holds from ~ 0.087 to 3.49 μ g/mL. The proposed method was also used for the direct analysis of antiepileptic tablets.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use standard solutions in the Floyd method because as shown by Papadoyannis the standard solutions allow formation of calibration charts for determining concentrations and checking the day-to-day precision and accuracy.

- 8. Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dreassi in view of Floyd as explained above and Quaglia or DeAngelis. In the paper Dreassi teaches quantitative analysis of lamotrigine in plasma and tablets by planar chromatography and comparison with liquid chromatography and UV spectrophotometry. A method using planar chromatography (PC) was developed for determining lamotrigine (LTG) in human plasma and in tablets. LTG was extracted with MeCN in the presence of Na₂CO₃.
- 3,5-Diamino-6-(2-methoxyphenyl)- 1,2,4-triazine was used as internal standard. The detection limit was $0.27~\mu g/mL$ plasma and the recovery from human plasma fortified with various concentrations of LTG was 91.3%. No interference from other common antiepileptic agents was found. The results obtained with the PC method were compared with those obtained by a method using liquid chromatography for analysis of plasma and tablets. On page 1278 Dreassi teaches the formation of calibration standards and the operating conditions including the method of quantification. Dreassi does not teach the quantification of any impurities.

In the paper Quaglia teaches the determination of chlorthalidone and its impurities in bulk and in dosage forms by high-performance thin-layer chromatographic densitometry. Chlorthalidone and its impurities were determined in bulk and pharmaceuticals by high-performance TLC-densitometry with dioxane-iso-PrOH-25% NH₄OH-toluene-xylene (30:30:20:10:10) as the mobile phase. The relative standard deviation was 1.9% and the

Art Unit: 1743

recovery of chlorthalidone and the impurities from artificial mixtures was 96.4-102.0%. Pages 436-437 teach the preparation of standards for Chlorthalidone and two of its impurities which were then used for calibration and calculation of the actual concentration. See figure 1 for an example chromatogram. The method was simple, accurate, reproducible, and selective.

In the paper DeAngelis describes a quantitative thin-layer chromatography (TLC) procedure for the analysis of the anticonvulsant cinromide (I, 3-bromo-N-ethylcinnamamide) [58473-74-8] and its 2 major metabolites, 3-bromocinnamamide [71539-43-0] and 3-bromocinnamic acid [32862-97-8], in plasma of the dog. These compounds were recovered from acidified plasma by extraction into benzene, with a recovery of 95%. All 3 compounds were quantitated directly on a TLC plate by UV absorbance densitometry at 270 nm. The linear range for the quantification of the compounds on a TLC plate was 10-1000 ng. The complete procedure is useful in the range 50-100 g/mL plasma, with a relative standard deviation of about 10%. The specificity of the method for the parent drug and each of its metabolites was confirmed by high-performance liquid chromatography. The method was used to determine the pharmacokinetics of cinromide and its 2 major plasma metabolites in dogs following a single oral dose of the drug. Pages 354-356 teach the preparation of standards of each of the compounds and the spotting of these standards and samples on to the TLC plates for quantification and verification of the samples.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the planar and liquid chromatography methods of Dreassi to determine stability/impurities in the tablet or other formulations of lamotrigine as taught by Floyd using standards of lamotrigine and it known impurities as taught by Floyd because as taught by Quaglia or DeAngelis standard compositions of the expected or known components in the composition assist in verifying and quantifying the components of pharmaceutical formulations.

9. Applicant's arguments filed December 18, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant should note that each of claims 12-15 are the rejected portion of original claims 1, 2, 4 and 11. The primary reason for not making this action final is that the WO publication of the Floyd patent is used in the rejections because it is anticipatory under 35 USC 102(b).

Art Unit: 1743

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arlen Soderquist whose current telephone number is (571) 272-1265 as a result of the examiner moving to the new USPTO location. The examiner's schedule is variable between the hours of about 5:30 AM to about 5:00 PM on Monday through Thursday and alternate Fridays.

A general phone number for the organization to which this application is assigned is (571) 272-1700. The fax phone number to file official papers for this application or proceeding is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Helm Soleyust
February 25, 2004
ARLEN SODEROUIST

PRIMARY EXAMINER